

Amend Claim 19 as follows:

1 19. (Amended) The method as set forth in Claim 18 wherein said step of maintaining
2 [disengageably engaging] includes the step of magnetically attracting [creating and maintaining
3 magnetic attraction between] the insert to [and] the receiver when the insert and receiver become
4 [are] engaged with one another upon mounting of the arrow on the bowstring.

Amend Claim 21 as follows:

1 21. (Amended) The method as set forth in Claim 20 wherein said step of maintaining
2 [disengageably engaging] includes the step of magnetically attracting [creating and maintaining
3 magnetic attraction between] the insert to [and] the receiver when the insert and receiver become
4 [are] engaged with one another upon mounting of the arrow on the bowstring.

REMARKS

By the above amendments to Claim 6 to incorporate the subject matter of the claims from which it depended, it is believed that it is allowable, which allowance is respectively requested.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9-13 and 16-21 have been rejected as anticipated by the teachings contained in the Frantello patent. In the discussion below, the disclosure contained in the Frantello patent will be reviewed and correlated with the subject matter recited in the rejected claims to render it self evident that the claims do not and can not be anticipated by any disclosure contained in the Frantello patent.

The Frantello patent is directed to an arrow release secured to the bowstring of a bow. The rear end of the arrow to be used with the arrow release does not include a nock. Instead, it includes a device for releaseably engaging the arrow release. As pointed out by the Examiner, a magnet 21 can be secured to arrow release 20 and cooperates with a magnet 19' secured to the butt of the arrow.

As clearly set forth in paragraph D of Claim 1, the present invention includes a two-part nock having an insert secured to the arrow and a receiver engaging the bowstring. Retention of the insert with the receiver is effected by a magnet. As is clearly evident from Figure 4 of Frantello, a nock, as recited in Claim 1 is not present nor even suggested. Thus, Claim 1 cannot be anticipated by the disclosure contained in the Frantello patent and allowance of Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom is requested.

Claim 9 is directed to a nock having an insert attached to the arrow, a receiver attached to the bowstring and a magnet disengageably engaging the insert and the receiver. The Frantello device does not disclose the use of a nock. Hence, it also cannot disclose the use of a two-part nock as recited in Claim 9. Accordingly, the invention recited in Claim 9 cannot be anticipated by the Frantello disclosure. Claim 9, and the claims depending therefrom are therefore clearly allowable over the Frantello disclosure.

Claim 18 recites the step of capturing a bowstring within a notch of a receiver. No such step can be performed by the Frantello device. Accordingly, Claim 18 is not and cannot be

anticipated by the Frantello disclosure. Allowance of Claim 18 and the claims depending therefrom is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7 and 14 have been rejected as clearly anticipated by the Laabs patent. The relevant disclosure of the Laabs patent will be reviewed below and correlated with the subject matter recited in the rejected claims.

The device disclosed in the Laabs patent does not embody a magnet to retain engagement of an arrow with a bowstring. The only relationship of the Laabs device with the present invention is that element 1 is penetrably engageable with the interior of a tubular arrow shaft.

Claims 1 and 9, from which Claims 7 and 14, respectively, depend, recite the use of a magnet to maintain engagement of the arrow with the bowstring prior to discharge of the arrow. No such teaching is contained in the Laabs patent. Accordingly, the invention recited in Claims 1, 7 and 14 cannot be anticipated by any disclosure contained in the Laabs patent. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 has been rejected as reciting subject matter obvious over certain teachings contained in the Laabs patent in view of further teachings contained in the Frantello patent. In particular, the Examiner contends that somehow the magnet of Frantello could be employed in the Laabs device. Even if such modification were possible, the possibility of which is not evident to the undersigned, the resulting device would still be short of the subject matter recited in Claim 15

and in Claim 9 from which it depends. In particular, the Laabs device does not capture the bowstring as recited in Claim 9. Instead, it releaseably grips sphere 5 and becomes completely disengaged from either both the sphere and the bowstring upon discharge of an arrow. Thus, even if a magnet were incorporated, the resulting device would fall short of the subject matter recited in Claim 15. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Pursuant to request, a substitute Figure 1 is submitted herewith. This figure now illustrates, representatively, a bow 31 attached to bowstring 32, as described in the specification and recited in the claims. Entry of informal Figure 1 is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims to more particular point out and distinctly claim the invention, the discussion of the prior art and its failings, the correlation of the subject matter recited in the claims with the applied prior art noting the differences therebetween and the submission of a substitute Figure 1, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

////

Charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 03-0088. This request is submitted in **DUPLICATE**.

Respectfully submitted,

CAHILL, SUTTON & THOMAS P.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Robert von Hellens', written in a cursive style.

C. Robert von Hellens
Reg. No. 25,714

155 Park One
2141 East Highland Ave.
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
Phone (602) 956-7000
c:\wp8rb\patofc\6260-A-1 response

A